DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 031 214 JC 690 248

By-Anders, Don F.

Proposed Junior College Administrative Action and Reaction to the Student Activist.

Pub Date 14 Dec 68

Note-21p.; Seminar paper

EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$1.15

Descriptors-*Activism, *Administrative Policy, *Administrator Responsibility, Demonstrations (Civil), *Junior Colleges, Political Power, Violence

This study examined student activists and their characteristics, demands, and goals. Student politics no longer retain only their traditional liberalism, but include many philosophies--idealism, revolution, conservatism, reaction, etc. Four traits shared by the activists were a desire to master frustration rather than conform, a will to change society, a tendency to introspection, and a willingness to risk future success for immediate ideals. The author relates the history and goals of several of the more radical groups, their activities on the campus, and their nationwide impact. As they extend their influence from the university to the junior college, administrators must prepare for them by understanding the reasons for their demands and adopting policies to prevent violence. Clear grievance procedures and recognition of due process would head off most disruption. Of possible reactions by a governing board--confrontation, confusion, and confidence--only the last could treat the problem with reason and judgment, being open-minded to honest dissension and condemning anarchy. The author concluded that administration must (1) learn more about the student's academic and private life, (2) appreciate non-cognitive and non-verbal behavior, (3) drop its authority in loco parentis, (4) cultivate trust in the student, and (5) grant him more say in planning his educational future. (HH)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ED031214

Proposed Junior College Administrative Action and Reaction to the Student Activist

Don F. Anders

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

JUN 12 1969

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGE
INFORMATION

JC 690 248

December 14, 1968

During this decade evidences of student unrest and effective protest have become increasingly common on college campuses. While frequently misunderstood and exaggerated by both journalists and educators, it does seem to be developing into a very significant factor on college campuses throughout our nation.

Fortunately, from the junior college viewpoint, this unrest has not yet taken the violent form and universal dispersion at the junior college level as at the University and State College level. However, sufficient reports of isolated incidents are now reported to suggest to junior college administrators that their relative good fortune is about to end. Lombardi, reporting on junior college activism, lists 17 major types of disruptive activities reported in California junior colleges in the last several months ranging from legal challenges of administrative decisions to throwing fire bombs.(22)

If the junior college administrator is not to be condemned to repeat the errors of recent history he must learn from them. It shall be the purpose of this paper to consider the student activist, his individual and organizational characteristics, his goals and demands. Implications of these characteristics for the junior college governing board and administration will be drawn.

The Student Activists

Who Are They?

The composite political viewpoint of the typical university or college student is usually near dead center but generally more liberal than conservative. Until quite recently this composite

viewpoint has traveled across the line toward conservativism and back, but seldom has it drifted far from center. During the last few years the establishment of a "New Left" has caused the view to move farther toward the left than ever before. As an increasing proportion of our population enters college this drift to the left becomes more pronounced.

Attempts to deal with student activism as a monolithic structure have floundered in confusion and misunderstanding. Actually the student population should be divided into two groups, The Non-Activist and the Activist. Still further, the Activist must be divided into two sub-groups, the Idealists and the Revolutionists. Even within these last two groups there are subdivisions. The Existentialists, Minority Groups Organizations, and the Middle Class Liberals are sub-groups of the Idealists and organizations such as the Black Students Union and the Students for a Democratic Society are in the Revolutionists' camp.

At this point some definitions are in order. Van Loon (19) compared the results of several studies on the Stanford and Berkeley campuses for the purpose of identifying the typical college activist. He characterized the Non-Activist as success-oriented, self denying, conventional, competitive, self-controlled, and orderly. For our purposes we may define as within this non-activist group the Conservative which would probably include the Young Republicans Club, and the Reactionary which would probably describe the John Birch Society Chapter. He found the Activists to share four broad psychological characteristics: (1) An orientation toward mastery of frustrating conditions rather than

submission and conformity, (2) a will to change the social environment, (3) a tendency to explore the inner life, and (4) a willingness to risk future social and economic opportunities in the pursuit of some abstract but immediate ideal of justice.

Continuing toward the left we have the Essentialists who Shoben (17) characterizes as tradition oriented, idealistic, preoccupied with eternal verities, with what is permanent, rational, formal and universal. Shoben also describes the Existentialist as one who sees the future leading to depersonalization, the denial of individuality, and leading to the final, inescapable authoritarian social structure: he considers meanings to be found only in the concrete of personal experiences. He would advocate an education that centers around sensed problems, that develops affects as well as the intellect, that "tells it like it is."

Next, we find a new member of the spectrum, the Middle Class Caucasian Liberal who has risen above the ghetto level and now has guilt feelings about those still remaining. He wants a better world and is prepared to work for it through the traditional channels of government.

Farther left is the Minority Organization Member who is more militant in his demands and somewhat less tolerant of a slow rate of change. (CORE, SNCC, NAACP are examples)

At the extreme left is the "New Left containing highly militant minority groups such as the Black Students Union and the Student Syndicalists such as the Students for a Democratic Society whose avowed purpose is the destruction of the present "establishment" in order to build a new radical society.(8)

Given all of these groups on a single campus, almost no single administrative policy or philosophy will function without difficulty. Fortunately, when they do all exist simultaneously on the campus their membership is disproportionate. Somewhere in this group, and particularly on the junior college campuses, is the Unstudent who, according to Ohles(14) has entered the college without a commitment, wandering through the academic halls without direction. He is the lost soul, once found on skid row but now in college. Society is his enemy but the institution is his target. He may be among the most intelligent on campus but his sole purpose is revenge on society by way of the college.

How Did They Get This Way?

In attempting to understand and evaluate the new student activism and to anticipate its future development, it may be helpful to consider some of the reasons this movement should be taking place now.

One basic reason is the fact that this is a generation which has never known Peace, whose members have grown up with the knowledge that constantly hanging over their heads is the very real possibility of immediate self-destruction. This has created not only an amount of cynicism but also a sense of urgency, the "now generation." Since current conditions do not favor future-directed values, the present college student tends to downgrade the acquisition of property, he is unimpressed and sometimes even contemptous of it. As reverence for property has dimished, youth have come to value the intrinsic worth of human relationships. There is an emphasis on being rather than doing.

Another powerful factor in producing student activism is an environment that has nourished earlier competence and independence. With greater freedom to move about and instantaneous communications the youth is exposed to adult problems at an early age, generating a degree of sophistication not prevalent in past generations. Youth have been given broad horizons which qualify them as citizens of the world, both in experience and in knowledge. Yet we insist on actually retarding their participation in the adult world, beyond that of earlier generations. This has produced a deep disillusionment and a restless impatience. They are eager for change and the immediate correction of long standing social ills and injustices and necessarily react against the organization which is apparently holding them back and perpetuating these wrongs.

Within the school, the activists cite the need for curriculum which is more related to their "inner" needs and for teaching which is not the impersonal, ineffectual, presentations they experience today. Essentially all of this boils down to one common central point: students want more control over their lives, including their education. They fear the impersonal future of 1984 and feel they are becoming the forgotten man in education. They say that, if the University exists for the student then the student ought to have something to say about its operation." They resent their second class citizenship status in undergraduate education and strongly resent the platitudes constantly expressed concerning student-establishment relationships which they know to be untrue in practice. And, they intend to do something about their fate.

How Are They Organized?

Students have been rebelling against "injustice" for over one hundred years. The revolutions of 1848 in Germany and Austria were aided and influenced by student reaction as was the fall of Tsarist Russia. In many parts of the world the University is operated or strongly influenced by student opinion. It is really rather surprising that the drive for student power has taken so long to develop in this country.

While various organizations have risen and fallen over the years, the current wave of student activism begins with development of the SDS, (Students for a Democratic Society) as an arm of the League for Industrial Democracy during the civil rights drives of 1960-61. The Student League for Industrial Democracy was a relatively inactive organization until breaking away from the parent organization in 1961 and organizing itself along the lines of SNCC, (Students Non-Violent Coordinating Committee). They agreed to recruit on college campuses and to adopt the twinned notions that a broader array of goals than those defined by civil rights were necessary, and that achievement of these aims required a more directly political involvement. In June 1962 some 150 students gathered in Port Huron, Michigan to form the "New Left," and from its first pronouncement the SDS was born. By September 1962 eleven chapters had enrolled about 300 members. By 1966 the numbers had grown to 20,000 members in 200 chapters. This year the estimate is in excess of 30,000 members, with several times that many more who are sympathetic to the SDS cause. While the Vietnam war and the draft are common issues, all types of racial and social injustices are subject to selection as an

issue. Civil disobedience and active resistance, not all of it non-violent, have become more frequent, excused on the ground that the "establishment" fails to listen when protests are merely verbal. SDS has set its sights on the reforming of society at large and on the reconstitution of the American University. They want "a union of students in which the students themselves decide what kind of rules they want or don't want. Or whether they need rules at all. Only this kind of organization allows for decentralization and the direct participation of students in all decisions daily affecting their lives.///Participitory democracy is often like achronic and contagious disease, once caught it permeates one's whole life and the lives of those around. Its effect is disruptive in a total sense, and within a manipulative bureauocratic system, its articulation and expression amounts to sabotage. It is my hope that those exposed to it during the time they are building a movement for student syndicalism will never be quite the same, especially after they leave the University community." (8)

The origin of the Student Non-violent Coordinating Committee (SNCC) is somewhat confused but the most obvious beginning can be attached to four Negro students in 1960 who decided that direct action was required of individuals if equal rights for black people were to be achieved. Accordingly they organized the first lunch counter sit-in in Greensboro, N. C. Within a week other sit-ins were taking place all over the country. For the first time in America young people, almost all of them college undergraduates, had seized political initiative with respect to a vital issue.(16)

Attempts to develop a formal organization failed then and have not been successful to date. It is not a "membership" organization, has no structure of local chapters, and anyone present may cast an equal vote at national conferences. There have been three significantly different phases in SNCC to date. The first phase, the integrationist phase, emphasized a strategy of autonomous, sporadic acts and direct-action civil disobedience accompanied by arrest and trials, developed about 1960 and is still continuing. The community-organizing phase began in August 1961 and involves voter registration programs, freedom schools and organization of field workers. From these field worker organizations came the practioners as well as the preachers of the New Left concept of "participatory democracy." The present black power phase arose as a result of the setbacks of 1964 and 1965. Out of the frustrations of a series of defeats and inequities was created a sense of bitterness and a desire for more militant and effective forms of political power. Those leaders who embraced this militant approach seemed to be the only ones succeeding and by May 1966 SNCC had endorsed a close version of the Black Power statement. Thus, the focus of SNCC has shifted towards independent Black Power, fierce racial pride, and militant support of revolutionary forces in the Third World.

New and old "hard-core" SNCC people began to organize Black Students Unions on predominantly white campuses and have succeeded in keeping SNCC as the one organization which commands, in a loose but effective fashion, the bulk of the Negro leadership in the U. S. As a result several expectations follow, some of which have already been confirmed by the events of 1968. One, an increasing number of

all-black political blocs and parties at local levels and within student movements. Second, a sporadic, but increasing number of rebellions in predominately negro colleges. Third, a possible spinning off of the Black Students Union from the National Student Association, thus reducing the effectiveness of any coalition of the more moderate and typically liberal students of both ethnic groups. Fourth, more strongly encouraged, militant demand by Negro students on white campuses for special conditions such as housing, curriculum, black professors and administrators. Finally, the Washington and New York headquarters are talking more and more about goals accomplished "by any means necessary" and imply a storing of weapons against "the day." (16)

The Black Students Union is organized on a national base into local chapters. They seek support and guidance from the Black Panther Organization and legal support from The American Civil Liberties Union. They tolerate the assistance of the SDS and The Third World Liberation Front and all others who would assist them in the attainment of their goals but they do not support the individual efforts of any other group.

The Third World Liberation Front (TWLF) was organized as a more militant branch of various minority group organizations. They are attempting to obtain for the brown, yellow, and red minorities the same gains the BSU has obtained for the blacks, and using essentially the same tactics.

What Are Their Goals?

Since there are so many groups involved in campus activism a single list of goals common to all activists is not possible.

Ranging from those groups near the center of the political spectrum toward the New Left, one may list a few of the more obvious goals however.

The Activist wants to participate in the planning of his educational future. He wants to have more curricular offerings which are related to his inner needs. He wants to eliminate impersonal, ineffectual teaching in large classes in ever larger Universities. He does not want to become the forgotten man in education. He wants to be treated as an equal partner in the educational process.(19)

The Activist wants to establish his right to be a first class citizen on campus. The Student Bill of Rights demands the college agree to the abandonment or amendment of the principle of <u>in loco parentis</u>, and the student is saying more and more, "We have a right to be wrong, to make mistakes, and, if necessary, to suffer the consequences of our mistakes." (18) Implicit in these Rights is the need to reexamine the student relationship to the bureauocratic college structure to determine those areas of college life which students can and ought to handle either for themselves or dojointly with the faculty and administration which, if students were allowed such participation, would materially contribute to their personal and educational growth.

The goal of the Unstudent is simple revenge against society and/or the college. He has no desire to improve either himself or the college.

The goals of minority member organizations of the non-militant type are fairly obvious. They feel they have been denied an equal

opportunity to an education and they want this wrong righted. This generates demands for lowered entrance requirements and special classes or tutors for minority students, scholarships, and/or grants to overcome financial handicaps, and no racial or economic bar to achievement or interest groups on the campus.

The Existentialist feels the University should rid itself of its facade of false morality and standards and "tell it like it is," He demands an experimental university free to decide what will be taught by whom to whom, without any serious organization. He feels the institution should not remain neutral, that any organization not endorsing a cause is automatically against it.

The SDS insists upon complete institutional reform, "to build on the campuses a movement that has the primary purpose of racically transforming the university community." They want "a union of students in which the students themselves decide what kind of rules they want or don't want, or whether they need rules at all." (8) Past successes, including what they feel was a major role in inducing President Johnson to decide against seeking another term in the White House, have convinced the SDS leadership that the organization should set it sights on the reforming of society at large, beginning with the university until sufficient "alumni" are in position within society to bring about its reorganization.(16)

The Black Students Union goals are simple. They cite the four hundred years of "second-class citizenship" as sufficient reason to take over the operation of the institution either entirely or with the right to propose policy favorable to black students and to veto unfavorable policy. Nothing less is sufficient.

The Third World Liberation Front, just surfacing in student society refers to the non-white population as members of the "third world" and is, at the present time, a "me-too" organization, supporting the BSU and endeavoring to gain similar recognition for all minority groups in the same militant way the BSU is operating. Presumably this would include the "Brown" and the "Yellow" minorities as well as the "Red" American Indian. It is a colorful and potentially potent force.

IMPLICATIONS FOR THE JUNIOR COLLEGE

Except in the larger cities, the student activist has largely confined his efforts to the Universities and four-year colleges. As the movement becomes more successful and larger in size it is inevitable that the activist will soon be on every junior college campus. Indeed the SDS has already made plans for infesting the senior high school and some efforts in that direction are already reported by Brammen (5) and Shoben.(17) Since it appears that this student bid for greater power and influence will not wane and has some justification(18) the only course of effective action for the junior college administrator is to learn about, and attempt to understand what the students are saying; to join them in seeking out inequities and attempt to correct them before students resort to irresponsible acts resulting in a confrontation which must necessarily result in repression of the student or surrender by the administration.

Collins cautions, "behavior is caused: when there is unrest among students it is because there are real or imagined infringe-

ments on basic rights. Demonstrations are really denunciatory editorials by those who have no other media for voicing their views, for airing their grievances, and for insisting on corrective measures." (7)

In a similar vein Mayhew says, "Virtually every student uprising during the last four years has been caused because an administrator denied students' procedural rights...Behind every successful student outbreak stands some administrator who exercised discretion without legitimacy. Properly structured grievance procedures and procedural rights could have kept grievances within legitimate bounds." (12)

The kinds of disruptive activities to be expected range from "thrown firebombs" to "challenge of administrative disciplinary actions and decisions through the courts," according to Lombardi, who has prepared a list of 17 different activities already reported on California junior college campuses. (23)

Davidson suggests that the student syndicalist movement take on one of two possible structures, a Campus Freedom Democratic Party (CFDP), or a Free Student Union (FSU) and that these organizations attempt to disrupt all student government either by harassment from without or by joining it and creating dissent and eventual dissolution from within. He advises them to develop a "government in exile" and attack by disobedience, vulnerable campus regulations such as dorm hours, use of alcohol, required questionaires, enrollment proccdures, parking requirements, etc. Significantly, he directs the primary attention of the movement toward the abolition of the grade system. He considers this the most vulnerable part of the "establishment" and most necessary to maintenance of the

status quo. He would approach liberal teachers and students with the Radical Curriculum ideas of Paul Goodman and A.S. Neil and demand student voice in developing the curriculum, determination of class size and of the instructor for the course, to encourage "liberated faculty members" to work out a counter-curriculum and agitate for its adoption, and finally to hold mock trials for the dean of men and women for their "crimes against humanity." (8)

ADMINISTRATIVE ACTION AND REACTION

Chapman (6) has identified three approaches to serve as models for a governing board in dealing with these students activists behavior problems. First, is the confrontation approach, in which the governing board firmly and openly asserts its power under such circumstances. A confrontation of this type matches the power of policy and reinforcement by a constitutional body as opposed to the psychological force of a group of students who are reinforced by a commitment to a common goal of producing stress in the environment. The psychological frame of reference from which a board would operate under this model would be that of insecurity, distrust, regidity, and coercion. Also they might have to back down, risking all for little gain. Second is the confused approach which would lead the governing board to act without a knowledge of what its role should be in such matters. It would set up hearings with all groups and make policy as it goes. The psychological climate under which a board would operate under such a model would be that of frustration, uncertainty, and need for activity. The third, and only reasonable one according to Chapman, is the confidence approach which would consider the problem in the light of reason and good judgement. The board would feel secure with

its policy and place its confidence in its president to work out solutions based upon policy determined, and frequently reviewed, during non-stress periods. The board would resist all pressures for hasty or unfair action. The psychological attitude of the board would be one of security, trust, openness, confidence, and a willingness to ascertain the facts before acting, if then. Although the first two models have succeeded to some degree in ages past, this latter model Chapman considers the only successful one remaining because of three changes which have occurred in our society: the character of higher education has changed so that we are now educating the masses, not the elite; the character of academic freedom has changed, freedom to teach has become freedom to teach to learn; the character of constitutional liberties has changed, students are now entitled to the right of due process, equal opportunity, and sensible citizenship rights.

Johnston (10) suggests the only logical course for an institution to follow currently is a policy of complete open-mindedness to honest demonstrators or dissenters who are willing to discuss problems within the institution system. Administrators must recognize the system as it exists now is not perfect and they must convince the demonstrators that anarchy is self-defeating, developing inevitably a reaction from the majority of society that could result in totalitarianism, a reaction, by the way, already noticed on some campuses to be developing strength. He would encourage dissent but only if accompanied by free debate and dialogue.

Even the American Civil Liberties Union recognizes that "the manner in which demonstrations have been conducted, at least in some notorious cases, must be condemned as improportionate to the

grievances of the student and as categorically in violation of basic principles of academic freedom." (21) They associate student activism with a "progressive neglect of certain principles ... together with a change in the nature of the student body and its relations with faculty and administration..." They recommend "a review of the structure and internal relations of the university on every campus..."

The concerned educator must face at least five issues which are directly related to student unrest, according to Sparzo. (18) First, educators must learn more about the students' academic and non-academic life. Second, that we have neglected almost completely the non-symbolic aspects of the process of learning, the non-cognitive and non-verbal aspects of behavior. The educator must see students as people first, not as organisms into which we put a "liberal education." Third, we must recognize that the principle of in loco parentis has been withering for some time and should either be abandoned or seriously amended. Today the mean age of American College students is more than 21 years and there are more students over the age of 30 than younger than 18 and, as Mayhew suggests, whether or not a student burns a draft card, participates in a civil rights march, engages in premarital, or extramarital sexual activity, becomes pregnant, attends church, sleeps all day or drinks all night is not really the concern of...an educational institution, unless it effects the educational progress of the student. (12) Fourth, educators should realize that today's students are asking to be treated with more trust than they have in the past, and not to over-regulate their lives solely because of the actions of a few. Fifth,

be examined. The student is asking for a louder voice in the planning of his educational future. He is unable to communicate with established spheres of authority. Perhaps each institution should have an Ombudsman as suggested by Kruszynski(11) to reestablish the communication link so necessary if solutions are to be reached. Through this individual, students should have a voice in policy recommendations to the governing board. Shoben(17) suggests that Leadership turn its attention to updating the policies and procedures developed nearly a century ago, consider our present society, the maturity of our youth, and what the activists are trying to say. The academic mind must turn its talents to the development or more inclusive modes of thought, especially in relation to the university itself.

The individual administrator must carefully review local school policies and regulations in the light of the characteristics of the "new" student. Any seriously out-of-date material must be discarded or updated and must stand the test question: Is this standard essential to the accomplishment of the real goals of this institution?

The administrator should seek faculty and student advice in these matters, and not just from the "nice" segment of the population. He must be available and approachable, recognizing that the student is really the main reason for his serving in an administrative capacity. He must be educable. He must learn flexibility and humility, and how to live with uncertainty. He must learn to take advice, to depend on the judgment of others. He must be able to back down

gracefully and admit error. He must develop a feeling for the exact time when a matter is really one of principle which requires a firm yes or no. This, in turn requires that he be completely certain of the validity of the goals of his institution and the regulations and policies assisting their accomplishments, and that he be able to prove their worth.

Only if the junior college administrator makes use of the short time still available to him to update administrative philosophy will he be able to avoid the mistakes and tragedies of the universities. Little time remains.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

1. Cross, K. Patricia The Junior College Student: A Research Description, Educational Testing Service, Princeton, New Jersey, 1968.

Articles

2. Albjerg, Marguerite, "The Role of the Activist on Today's Campus" College and University, 42, #3, Spr. 67, pg. 301-307.

3. Allen, James E. "Campus Activism and Unrest," School and Society, 96, #2310, Oct. 26, 1968, Pg. 357-359.

4. Anon "SDS Strategy and Tactics," Phi Delta Kappan XL #1, Sept. 1968, pg. 56.

5. Brammen, Lawrence, "The Coming Revolt of High School Students," NASSP Bulletin 52 #329, Sept. 1968, Pg. 13-20.

6. Chapman, James L. "The Board of Trustees and Student Behavior." School and Society, 92, #2310, Oct. 26, 1968, Pg. 363-364.

7. Collins, Charles "Student Rights and Due Process," Junior College Journal #7, April 1967, Pg. 34-36.

8. Davidson, Carl, "University Reform Revisited," (Reprinted from the Educational Record, Winter 1967, 48 #1)

9. Halleck, Seymour "Why They'd Rather do Their Own Thing," Think, Sept./Oct. 1968, Pg. 3-7.

10. Johnston, Orville W. "Amnesty vs. Order on College Campuses" School and Society 92 #2310, Oct. 26, 1968, Pg. 364-365.

11. Kruszynski, Eugene "An Ombudsman for Public Education," Phi Delta Kappan L, #3, Nov. 1968, Pg. 155-158.

12. Mayhew, Lewis "Quotes on Dissent," Phi Delta Kappan XL #1, Sept. 1968, pg. 19.

13. McKay, Dean "Quotes on Dissent," Phi Delta Kappan, XL, #1 Sept. 1968, Pg. 19.

14. Ohles, John F. "The University and the Unstudent," School and Society 92, #2310, Oct. 26, 1968, Pg. 361-362.

15. Redford, Edward "Profiting from Activism," Junior College Journal 38, #3, Nov. 1967, Pg. 87.

16. Shoben, E. J. Jr./Wardell, Philip R. "SDS and SNCC: Profiles of Two Student Organizations," School and Society #2310, Oct 26, 1968, Pg. 365-372.

17. Shoben, Edward "Student Unrest: Some Forms Within the Chaos" NASSP Bulletin V. 52, #329, Sept. 1968, Pg. 1-12.

18. Sparzo, Frank J. "Forcing the Issues of Student Unrest," School and Society, 96, #2310, Oct. 26, 1968, Pg. 359-361.

19. Van Loon, Eric "Who are the Activists?" American Education, 4 #1, Dec. 1967-Jan. 1968, Pg. 2-3.

Miscellaneous Publications

20. AAUP Joint Statement on Rights and Freedom of Students, 1967.

21. American Civil Liberties Union, Academic Freedom Committee Statement, June 26, 1968, reported in School and Society, V. 92 #2310, Oct. 26, 1968, Pg. 376.

Interviews

22. Interview with William E. Lewis, Dean of Students, Los Angeles Valley College, November 1968.

23. Personal Communication from Dr. John Lombardi, Nov. 1968.

24. Interview with Mrs. Marjorie Lord, Dean of Students, Los Angeles Pierce College, Nov. 1968.